

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Madam President. I just want to address briefly the issue that Senator Kristensen raised. That was brought to my attention this morning by Bill Drafters. I think Senator Kristensen, it's appropriate that he brings that to your attention. My analysis is and was that that does not jeopardize the piece of legislation, that deals with only one component of the bill. There are many, many components, if you want to read the title. The other reason I think it does not jeopardize it is that the language about a rebuttable presumption is, as we have discussed, a higher or more stricter standard, however you wish to put it. And since I believe that the purpose of the caption or the title is to give notice, that the notice is actually of something more burdensome than the bill actually provides. If it were the other way around, that it gave you notice of something that was less stringent and the bill provided for something more burdensome, I would be a little bit more concerned. But because it actually gives notice of something that is more stringent than what is actually in the bill, I think that would cause a more careful examination. And since, again, the purpose is notice, you should be put even more on notice, if you will, because the caption is more burdensome than the content of the bill. So even though that is a technical flaw that resulted, and I don't want to impugn anyone's professionalism, but that's clearly a bill drafter's problem issue. We don't draft those provisions. I don't think it is an overriding problem with regard to the legislation in its entirety. I do appreciate the fact that Senator Kristensen brought that to your attention. As I say, it was brought to my attention this morning by Bill Drafters. But as I say, I did not think it impaired the legislation.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I rise in support of LB 1076, compelled by what has happened with regard to this bill and the controversy that has surrounded it. First, I rise in support of the bill on its merits, for all of its primary purposes relating to retirement. Secondly, I respectfully suggest that all procedures of law have been complied with; the bill has a title. It isn't a procedure of law that it has to have a title that's a correct title and a perfect title and a title that doesn't do anything wrong. It